



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/542,076

07/13/2005

Kai Eck

DE030024US1

8935

24737

7590

03/25/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

ZEILBERGER, DANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/25/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/542,076	Applicant(s) ECK, KAI	
	Examiner DANIEL ZEILBERGER	Art Unit 2624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DANIEL ZEILBERGER. (3) ____.

(2) THOMAS KOCOVSKY (REG. NO. 28,383). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 23 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Seeley et al. (US Patent 6,484,049).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the Examiner's interpretation of the limitation "providing a pattern of marking elements that are individually not visibly evident to a computer system and to a human viewer of the diagnostic image". The Applicant asked for the Examiner's opinion of various possible amendments, to which the Examiner commented but no agreement was reached as to precise claim language.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Daniel Zeilberger/ Examiner, Art Unit 2624	/Vikkram Bali/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624
--	--